



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,478	10/20/2003	Daniel S. Papenfuss	20717	7892
30482	7590	12/08/2009		
BEMIS COMPANY, INC. Patent and Trademark Department 2200 BADGER AVENUE OSHKOSH, WI 54904			EXAMINER PATTERSON, MARC A	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/08/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/689,478

Applicant(s)

PAPENFUSS ET AL.

Examiner

MARC A. PATTERSON

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/689,478	PAPENFUSS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARC A. PATTERSON	1794	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Marc Patterson. (3) Christine Parsons.
 (2) Rena Dye. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all of the record.

Identification of prior art discussed: all of the record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant cited typographical errors in the Office Action dated August 20, 2009, and a replacement Office Action was suggested by the Examiner.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Marc A Patterson/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is intended to replace the Office Action of August 20, 2009.

WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

1. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 1 - 13 and 17 - 23 as being unpatentable over Andersen et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,903) in view of Notomi et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,985,849), of record on page 2 of the previous Action, is withdrawn.

2. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 14 - 16 and 24 - 67 as being unpatentable over Andersen et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,660,903) in view of Notomi et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,985,849) and further in view of Gehrke (U.S. Patent No. 5,783,266), of record on page 5 of the previous Action, is withdrawn.

NEW REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

3 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 - 13, 17 - 23 and 68 - 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunch (U.S. Patent No. 3,608,815).

With regard to Claims 1 and 9, Bunch discloses a laminate (column 2, lines 3 - 8), therefore adhered by adhesive lamination, comprising layers of film for packaging, which are

Art Unit: 1794

flexible (column 2, lines 3 - 8), therefore having an internal surface and external surface; comprising a polymer (column 2, lines 3 - 8), each layer comprising an external surface pattern (surface having puncture pattern; column 2, lines 65 - 71), and score lines for the purpose of bending the film (column 3, line 15); the film is laminated to at least one layer of metal foil (column 2, lines 3 - 8); the layers are oriented (column 2, lines 3 - 8); if the laminate is used with a machine, there are no rough areas in the pattern (column 3, lines 30 - 34). Bunch therefore discloses rough areas in the pattern if the laminate is not used with a machine. Bunch fails to disclose a first film layer, second film layer comprising adhesive, barrier layer, and fourth film layer, and a fourth film layer, and orientation that is biaxial. However, as Bunch discloses the lamination of layers of film and foil, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided for the lamination of four layers of film, alternately, with four layers of foil, therefore an intermediate film layer of adhesive; furthermore, as Bunch discloses orientation, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided for orientation in either one or two directions, depending on the desired directions of tearing.

With regard to Claims 2 - 3, Bunch discloses no shrinkage; the claimed aspect of 0% shrinkage at 85 degrees Celsius in the machine and transverse directions therefore reads on Bunch et al.

With regard to Claim 4, as discussed above, the film disclosed by Bunch is adhered by adhesive lamination, and therefore comprises a fifth film layer positioned between the third film layer and fourth film layer which comprises an adhesive.

With regard to Claim 5, Bunch disclose a multilayer film having a fourth layer having a score line as discussed above. Bunch fails to disclose a score line having a depth of 50 - 95% of

Art Unit: 1794

the thickness of the layer. However, Bunch teaches the score line for folding, as stated above, and therefore teaches the selection of the depth to obtain desired folding.

With regard to Claims 6 - 7, Bunch comprises score lines, as stated above, therefore continuous and non - continuous.

With regard to Claim 8, the claimed aspect of the score line being made by optical ablation is directed to a method limitation and is therefore given little patentable weight.

With regard to Claims 12 - 13, because Bunch discloses layers of polymer, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided for a polymer comprising polyamide, which is identical to the claimed barrier material, and therefore has an oxygen transmission rate of $0.01 - 1.00 \text{ cm}^3/100 \text{ in}^2$ and the claimed vapor transmission rate.

With regard to Claim 17, Bunch discloses an adhesive that is a cold - seal adhesive, because a laminate is disclosed, therefore adhered to any surface of the layers.

With regard to Claims 18 - 19, the layers disclosed by Bunch have internal and external surfaces as discussed above.

With regard to Claim 20, the film disclosed by Bunch is for packages (column 1, lines 9 - 17); it therefore would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided for a thickness, through routine optimization, depending on the desired strength of the package.

With regard to Claim 21, the film disclosed by Bunch is oriented as discussed above, and forms a package, therefore bent and therefore has an easy opening tear feature and therefore forms a package comprising a tear initiation area and a directional tear zone; the film comprises polyethylene and is therefore sealable (column 2, line 20) and Bunch therefore discloses a packaging having a top first edge seal portion and an opposite bottom second edge seal portion in

Art Unit: 1794

parallel with the top first edge seal portion and a third seal portion disposed perpendicular between the top first seal edge portion and bottom second seal edge portion and parallel to a folded side and at least one first folded side edge superimposed on the surface roughened portion on an external surface of the first film layer of the package.

With regard to Claims 22 - 23 and 68 - 81, Bunch disclose a cold - seal as discussed above, and therefore disclose a top first seal edge portion and bottom second seal edge portion.

5. Claims 14 - 16 and 24 - 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bunch (U.S. Patent No. 3,608,815) in view of Gehrke (U.S. Patent No. 5,783,266).

Bunch discloses a multilayer film layer comprising polyamide, therefore a barrier layer, as discussed above. With regard to Claims 14, 24 - 35, 38 - 52, 54 - 59 and 61 - 67, Bunch fail to disclose a barrier layer comprising a metallic coating on the external surface of the fourth film layer having a thickness from 200 - 700 Angstroms.

Gehrke teaches that a metallic coating (thin layer of metal formed by deposition; column 3, lines 27 - 32) is used interchangeably with polyamide (nylon; column 3, lines 27 - 32) as a barrier layer in a film (column 3, lines 27 - 32) for the purpose of obtaining a film that is a barrier to oxygen and moisture (column 3, lines 32 - 35). One of ordinary skill in the art would therefore have recognized the advantage of providing for the metallic coating of Gehrke in Bunch, which comprises a multilayer film, depending on the desired barrier to oxygen and moisture of the end product.

It therefore would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have provided for a metallic coating on the external surface of

Art Unit: 1794

the layers in Bunch in order to obtain a film that is a barrier to oxygen and moisture as taught by Gehrke. Gehrke fails to disclose a metallic coating having a thickness from 200 - 700 Angstroms. However, Gehrke teaches the selection of the coating depending on the desired strength (column 7, lines 53 - 60). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the utility of varying the thickness to obtain the desired strength. Therefore, the strength would be readily determined by through routine optimization of the thickness by one having ordinary skill in the art depending on the desired use of the end product as taught by Gehrke.

It therefore would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the thickness in order to obtain the desired strength, since the strength would be readily determined through routine optimization by one having ordinary skill in the art depending on the desired end result as shown by Gehrke.

With regard to Claims 15 - 16, 36 - 37, 53 and 60, Gehrke teaches a metal layer comprising aluminum, which is a metal (column 4, line 65).

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments regarding the rejections of the previous Action have been carefully considered and have been found to be persuasive. The rejections are therefore withdrawn. The new rejections above are directed to amended Claims 1 - 81.

Art Unit: 1794

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc A Patterson whose telephone number is 571-272-1497.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Marc A Patterson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794